APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,046	01/25/2002	Katsumi Kanasaki	RCOH-1044	3429

7590   05/03/2005

KNOBLE & YOSHIDA, LLC
Suite 1350
Eight Penn Center
1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER
SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/057,046	KANASAKI, KATSUMI
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Ranodhi Serrao	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 January 2002_.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _25 January 2002_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 12, and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Ouchi (5,978,836).

As per claims 1 and 21, Ouchi teaches a method and a computer readable

medium storing computer executable instructions of flexibly managing addresses for a

communication system (column 5, lines 16-30), comprising the steps of: requesting an

address definition from a second device to a first device (column 17, lines 5-28);

returning the address definition to the second device from the first device (column 17,

lines 5-28); obtaining a corresponding rule definition for the address definition (column

17, lines 29-40); generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding rule

definition at the second device (column 18, line 62-column 19, line 9); and returning the

newly generated address from the second address to the first device (column 17, lines

41-65).

As per claim 12, Ouchi teaches a system for flexibly managing addresses for a

communication system, comprising: a third device sending a re quest for an address

definition for u se with a predetermined operation; a second device connected to said

third device for receiving the request for the address definition and sending the request

for the address definition; and a first device connected to said second device for

returning the address definition to said second device in response to the address

definition request, said first device further including a address maintenance unit for

maintaining address information (column 12, lines 46-65: wherein email addresses A, B,

and C serve the function of a first, second, and third device); wherein said second

device obtaining a corresponding rule definition for the address definition (column 17,

lines 29-40) and generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding rule

definition (column 18, line 62-column 19, line 9), said second device returning the newly

generated address to said third device (column 17, lines 41-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ouchi (5,978,836) as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Taylor et

al. (5,754,306). Ouchi teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 12 as described above but

fails to teach wherein the addresses include e-mail addresses, document folders,

telephone number and fax numbers. Taylor et al. teaches wherein the addresses

include e-mail addresses, document folders, telephone number and fax numbers

(column 10, lines 28-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the

addresses include e-mail addresses, document folders, telephone number and fax

numbers in order to optimize user efficiency in electronic communications.

Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ouchi (5,978,836) as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in

view of Krishnaswamy et al. (5,999,525).

As per claims 3 and 14, Ouchi teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 12 as

described above but fails to teach wherein the first or second device is an existing user

account management unit for user account information. Krishnaswamy et al. teaches

wherein the first or second device is an existing user account management unit for user

account information (column 23, lines 37-47). It would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add

wherein the first or second device is an existing user account management unit for user

account information in order to allow authorized users on the network to have access to

this information.

As per claims 4 and 15, Ouchi teaches the limitations of claims 1, 12, and 14 as

described above but fails to teach an address maintenance unit that corresponds to the

existing user account management unit for managing address information.

Krishnaswamy et al. teaches an address maintenance unit that corresponds to the

existing user account management unit for managing address information (column 23,

lines 37-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add an address maintenance unit

that corresponds to the existing user account management unit for managing address information in order to allow authorized users on the network to have access to this information.

As per claim 10, Ouchi teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above but fails to teach wherein said generating the new address definition is performed prior to said requesting the address definition. Krishnaswamy et al. teaches wherein said generating the new address definition is performed prior to said requesting the address definition (column 108, lines 21-32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein said generating the new address definition is performed prior to said requesting the address definition in order to allow the directory service to use a client's information to select the best Internet Telephone Gateway for the client computer to use.

As per claims 11 and 20, Ouchi teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 12 as described above but fails to teach wherein the address definition each has a unique ID and further comprises additional steps of determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists. Krishnaswamy et al. teaches wherein the address definition each has a unique ID and further comprises additional steps of determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists (column 102, lines 50-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

above limitation to add wherein the address definition each has a unique ID and further comprises additional steps of determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists in order for the directory service to determine if an user associated with that VNET number is "on-line" and to identify the IP address of the location where the computer may be contacted.

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchi (5,978,836) and Krishnaswamy et al. (5,999,525).

As per claims 5 and 16, Ouchi and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of claims 1, 4, 12, 14, and 15 as described above but Krishnaswamy et al. fails to teach wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by adding a new delivery method. Ouchi however teaches wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by adding a new delivery method (column 12, lines 46-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by adding a new delivery method in order to go off route and capture the optimal route of transmission.

As per claim 6, Ouchi and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of claims 1, 4, and 5 as described above but Krishnaswamy et al. fails to teach wherein the new delivery method is specified in the rule definition. Ouchi however teaches wherein the new delivery method is specified in the rule definition (column 8, lines 13-31). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify the above limitation to add wherein the new delivery method is specified in the

rule definition in order to insure that the value for the active document is unique.

As per claims 7 and 18, Ouchi and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of

claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, and 16 as described above but Ouchi fails to teach wherein

the rule definition further includes or the address maintenance unit additionally manages

an ID value, a Source value, a Condition value, a Name Generation Method value, and

a Type Generation Method value. Krishnaswamy et al. however teaches wherein the

rule definition further includes or the address maintenance unit additionally manages an

ID value, a Source value, a Condition value, a Name Generation Method value, and a

Type Generation Method value (column 99, line 58-column 101, line 16: wherein VNET

numbers serve the function of a Condition value, unique ID serves the function of an ID

value, IP address serves the function of a Source value, a Name Generation Method

value, and a Type Generation Method value). It would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add

wherein the rule definition further includes or the address maintenance unit additionally

manages an ID value, a Source value, a Condition value, a Name Generation Method

value, and a Type Generation Method value in order to allow an user to register his/her

computer as "on-line" and available to receive calls.

As per claims 8 and 17, Ouchi and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of

claims 1, 4, 12, 14, and 15 as described above but Krishnaswamy et al. fails to teach

wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by deleting an

existing delivery method. Ouchi however teaches wherein the address maintenance unit

manages delivery methods by deleting an existing delivery method (column 6, line 48-column 7, line 7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by deleting an existing delivery method in order to permit more than one concurrent use of a workflow route.

As per claims 9 and 19, Ouchi and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of claims 1, 4, 12, 14, and 15 as described above but Ouchi fails to teach wherein the address maintenance unit updates the address information based upon the user account information. Krishnaswamy et al. however teaches wherein the address maintenance unit updates the address information based upon the user account information (column 41, lines 27-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the address maintenance unit updates the address information based upon the user account information because cache copies must be refreshed when the version is out of date.

As per claim 22, Ouchi teaches a computer readable medium storing computer executable instructions for performing the tasks of flexibly managing addresses for a communication system, the computer executable instructions comprising the steps of: requesting an address definition from a second device to a first device (column 17, lines 5-28); returning the address definition to the second device from the first device (column 17, lines 5-28); obtaining a corresponding rule definition for the address definition (column 17, lines 29-40); generating a new address definition based upon the

corresponding rule definition at the second device (column 18, line 62-column 19, line 9); returning the newly generated address from the second address to the first device (column 17, lines 41-65). Ouchi fails to teach the address definition each has a unique ID; determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists. Krishnaswamy et al. however teaches the address definition each has a unique ID; determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists (column 102, lines 50-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add the address definition each has a unique ID; determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists in order for the directory service to determine if an user associated with that VNET number is "on-line" and to identify the IP address of the location where the computer may be contacted.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bromley et al. (5,819,263) teaches a financial planning system incorporating relationship and group management. Kennedy et al. (6,651,217) teaches a system and method for populating forms with previously used data values. Henderson

(6,427,064) teaches a method and apparatus for maintaining a database in a portable

communication device. Reed et al. (6,088,717) teaches a computer-based

communication system and method using metadata defining a control-structure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-

7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER